BOHAIRIC, a major dialect of Coptic, called "MEMPHITIC," "the northern dialect," or "dialect of Lower Egypt" in earlier terminology, and simply "Coptic" in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century treatises. Bohairic being the first Coptic dialect with which Western scholarship became acquainted. "Bohairic" (*B*) was first used by Stern (1880, p. xii).

Originally the northern local dialect of the western Delta (Buhaira) and Wādī al-Natrūn, Bohairic spread dramatically (beginning after, and as an indirect result of, the ARAB CONQUEST OF EGYPT) eastward and southward. In the eighth and ninth centuries it broke the monopoly of Sahidic as a Pan-Coptic idiom and by the eleventh century had largely completed the process of becoming virtually the sole dialect of Coptic. Bohairic became the official ecclesiastical language, and the classical Bohairic version of the Scriptures, the official text. Bohairic, which survives only as a liturgical language, was the dialect that saw Coptic out as the living idiom of Egypt. The old controversial question of its prehistory—whether it was never a literary language before the Arab conquest (Stern, 1880, p. 1; Lefort, 1931) or was, on the contrary, an old literary dialect (Worrell's opinion) has not yet been settled. What survives in the way of Bohairic documentation consists, on the one hand, of manuscripts later than the ninth century with scriptural, homiletic, hermeneutic, hagiographical, and liturgical texts and, on the other, a much smaller collection of fourth- and fifth-century fragments, all biblical (see sec. 5 on the varieties of Bohairic).

Bohairic shares isoglosses with most other dialects of Coptic, mainly with Fayyumic, Middle Egyptian (MESOKEMIC), Sahidic, and, more subtly, certain Nag Hammadi varieties of Sahidic (especially some tractates in Codex VII), DIALECT G and DIALECT P. The persistent, somewhat biased impression of Bohairic as an innovating dialect is refuted by careful internal and contrastive examination, which shows it to be rather of a conservative nature (cf. Shisha-Halevy, 1981). Not only its grammatical minutiae but even some major issues are still obscure and in need of rigorous and methodologically careful investigation. Far from being "sufficiently well known" (Kahle, 1954, p. 232), it has, following Steindorff's *Grammatik* of 1894, been superseded by Sahidic as far as research and tuition are concerned. (For Stern, 1880, it was still the primary illustration dialect.) Since the 1890s "Coptic" par excellence has been Sahidic, and Bohairic has been suffering grave scholarly neglect (cf. Erman, 1915, p. 161). This article will attempt to provide a brief typological profile of Bohairic grammar. While details of phonology and nonsystemic morphology are relatively well known, its *système de valeur* and syntax still hold quite a few mysteries for the linguist. The account given here is predominantly synchronic and noncontrastive.

1. Phonology, Morphophonology, and Graphemics

1.1. Probably the most striking feature of Bohairic is the nonpertinent, allophonic status of consonant aspiration in words of native Egyptian stock. The aspirated allophone (ϑ, ϕ, χ) occurs "combinatorily" before, and in contact with, a sonorant (any of /b/, /l/, /m/, /n/, /r/, /w/, and /j/) in initial clusters and elsewhere (ϫⲁϩ, crown; ⲁⲑⲙⲟⲩ, immortal; ⲫⲙⲉⲛⲣⲓⲧ, the beloved) or "spontaneously" as the onset of a stressed syllable (indeed, "stress" is a feature equivalent to "sonority," and thus the "spontaneousness" is relative and only a manner of speaking). ϭ, the allophone of ϫ before sonorants (ϭⲗⲟϭ, bed), nonetheless constitutes a phoneme (ϭⲏ, quince, versus ϫⲏ, dish).

1.2. The *B* phonemic inventory features the opposition /x/ : /h/, graphemically ϩ : ϩ (ϩⲣⲏ, lower part:ϩⲣⲏ, upper part).

1.3. The open final unstressed (posttonic) vowel in *B* is /i/ (ⲣⲱⲙⲓ, man; ⲙⲉⲩⲓ, think, thought). Table 1 displays the facts in the case of closed unstressed syllables (cf. Polotsky, 1933).

1.4. Nonfinal historical laryngeals (primary and

TABLE 1. *Closed Unstressed Syllables in Bohairic*

	POSTTONIC			
	STRESS SYLLABLE CLOSED		STRESS SYLLABLE OPEN	
PRETONIC	SONORANT ONSET	NO SONORANT	SONORANT CODA	SONORANT ONSET/ NO SONORANT
e	*e*	*Ø*	*e*	*Ø*
ⲥⲉⲛⲥⲱⲧⲛ	ⲥⲟⲑⲙⲉⲛ	ⲥⲟⲧⲧⲛ	ⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ	ⲥⲱⲗⲓ ⲥⲱⲧⲓ
ⲫⲉⲣϥⲱⲣⲛ				
entreat/ destroy him	hear him	choose him	hear	break choose

secondary, evolved from *r* or *t*) are not realized in Bohairic: ϥⲟⲛ†, in existence; ⲧⲏϐ, finger; ⲥⲉⲙⲓ, remain over; ⲛⲉ-, thy- (second fem. sing.) Finally, one finds *i*: second fem. sing. ϩⲱⲓ, thou too; ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛⲓ, stand thee up; masc. ⲟⲩⲁⲓ, one.

1.5. Palatal sibilant assimilation is the rule: ϥⲁⲛϥ, make live, nourish; ϥⲱϥ, despise.

1.6. Long diphthongs lengthened from short vowels occur with *w* and *j*: ϣⲓⲕ, bread; ϣⲟⲩ, honor.

1.7. The syllabicity of vowels and nasal sonorants is indicated by means of a superposed point (ⲭⲓⲛⲕⲓⲙ; see ⲇⲓⲛⲕⲓⲙ). In classical usage (manuscripts prior to the fourteenth century), this applies to any vowel constituting by itself a syllable (ⲁϥⲓ ⲉⲑⲟⲗ, he went out; ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲏ, bring [imp.]) and to ⲙ and ⲛ constituting a radical or a grammatical element and preceding another (ⲙⲧⲟⲛ, rest; ⲛⲟⲟϥ, he; ⲙⲫ†, for God). This syllabicity is canceled in certain combinatory circumstances (cf. Polotsky, 1949). In later Bohairic, one finds the djinkim on other consonants (ϫⲑⲟⲓ smell; ⲛⲛⲏⲟⲩ, you are coming).

1.8. Numbers are usually symbolized by letters and not written out (Dt. 34:8, ⲙⲍ ⲛϩⲓϩⲟⲟⲩ, for thirty days; Mk. 6:40, ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ϥ ϥ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡ ⲡ, by hundreds and by fifties).

1.9. The phoneme /i/ is usually expressed by an iota, even when initial (i, come, go; ⲓⲉⲓ, thirst).

1.10. Proclitically weak elements are not always marked as such (Erman, 1915): ⲁⲛⲟⲕ-, ⲟⲩⲟⲛ-, ⲙⲙⲟⲛ-.

2. Morphology and Word Formation

2.1. There is superficial (structurally resolvable) coincidence of the perfect base with the second present/future converter, both ⲁ (opposed to the circumstantial ⲉ). *a*-vocalism characterizes the preterite converter ⲛⲁϥ- and the negative aorist ⲙⲡⲁϥ-.

2.2. The relative converter ⲉⲧⲉ is common to the bipartite and all tripartite conjugation forms (ⲉⲧⲁϥ-, relative perfect).

2.3. The relative and second perfect converters coincide, as ⲉⲧ-, with systemic consequences.

2.4. The relative converter ⲉⲧⲉ has no prenominal allomorph, thus differing from the other three converters before the bipartite pattern. ⲉⲣⲉ- is an alternant (variant?) of the circumstantial before the existential ⲟⲩⲟⲛ. The converters and some bases have a -ⲣⲉ- allomorph before the short second plural suffix: ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛ-, ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛ-, ϥⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛ-, (ⲉⲧ)ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛ-, etc.

2.5. The base of the conjuctive is ⲛⲧⲉ-, prenominally as well as presuffixally. In the first singular the base-plus-actor is ⲛⲧⲁ-; in the third plural it is ⲛⲧⲟⲩ-, which is opposed to ⲛⲥⲉ-, the sole representative in Bohairic of a syntagm (the Sahidic conjunctive) in which ⲛ- marks as modifier a nexus of "actor plus verb."

2.6. The so-called third future is largely convertible in Bohairic (Stern, 1880, sec. 418–19; Andersson, 1904, pp. 62ff.).

2.7. In one variety of Bohairic (see 5.3) there occurs a special negative-conditional base, ⲁⲛⲛⲉ- (discussed by Černý, 1963, and Kasser, 1963). -ϥⲁⲛ occurs only in the affirmative form of the conditional clause-tripartite conjugation form. The negatived base coincides with the second present (ⲁⲣϥⲧⲉⲙ-), a coincidence that is diachronically significant but synchronically probably superficial.

2.8. The negative jussive (causative imperative) base is in Bohairic ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲟⲣⲉ-; its connection with the negative imperative characteristic ⲙⲡⲉⲣ- is thus severed.

2.9. The negative aorist base is ⲙⲡⲁ(-), showing diachronic affinities with the second tense.

2.10. ⲧⲉⲣⲁ- is the second singular feminine form of the future.

2.11. The first singular and third plural actor suffix pronouns are syllabic with the causative infinitive (ⲟⲣⲓ-, ⲟⲣⲟⲩ-) and negative third future (ⲛⲛⲓ-, ⲛⲛⲟⲩ-; cf. Polotsky, 1960, sec. 49).

2.12. Verb Lexeme/Stative Peculiarities. Historical *3ae infirmae -i* infinitives (Stern's class III) usually have no *-t*= in the pronominal state (ⲉⲛ/, bring; ⲙⲉⲥ/, give birth to; ϫⲉⲙ/, find; ϭⲁⲥ/, exalt). On the other hand, the imperative form marked by ⲁ often has *-t* = (ⲁⲣⲓⲧ/, do; ⲁⲛⲧ/, bring). Verbs of Greek origin have in Bohairic the Greek infinitive form (-ⲓⲛ, -ⲉⲥⲑⲉ) and are integrated in the Coptic conjugation by means of the auxiliary ⲉⲣ- (ⲉⲣ ϥⲟⲣⲓⲛ, bear; ⲉⲣ ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉⲥⲑⲉ, embrace, greet). The stative of the causative lexeme class ends in *-t* (-ⲏⲟⲩⲧ', ⲑⲁⲙⲓⲏⲟⲩⲧ', being created).

2.13. The imperative of "give" has three allomorphs: ⲙⲟⲓ, ⲙⲁ-, ⲙⲏⲓ/ (Polotsky, 1950, pp. 78ff.; 1971, 213ff.).

2.14. A verb-nominalization form in ϫⲓⲛ- is grammaticalized as ⲡϫⲓⲛⲧⲉ-/ⲑⲣⲉ- (Stern, 1880, sec. 470–72; Mk. 14:55, ⲉⲡϫⲓⲛϫⲟⲟⲩⲥϥ, to kill him).

2.15. The definite determinator pronoun {n} has only one form (with no special precluster allomorph).

2.16. Bohairic has a plural infix *-u-* (ⲁⲛⲁⲩϥ, oaths; ⲥⲛⲁϩ, fetters).

2.17. The first plural object suffix is usually (postconsonantally) -ⲧⲉⲛ (rarely -ⲉⲛ).

2.18. Postadjunctive Greek-origin adverbial modifiers may be marked by ⲛ (ⲛⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ).

3. Syntagmatics, Paradigmatics (Role Relationship), and Prosody

3.1. Focalization Patterns. The second tense focalizes adverbs only, not actor or object (pro)nouns (except for ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲣ ⲟⲩ, How are you?, cf. Polotsky, 1960, p. 409). Interrogative pronouns may be construed with an unmarked (basic tense) topic, especially the first perfect (Gn. 27:33, ⲛⲓⲙ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲣⲭⲉⲣⲭ ⲟⲩⲭⲟⲣⲥ ⲛⲏⲓ, Who then hunted game for me?), but enter more usually the nominal cleft-sentence pattern. In the latter case, the topic constituent is either the invariable ⲡⲉⲧ- (Polotsky, 1962, pp. 419f. [=*CP* 424]), which differs from the "substantivized" relative ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧ- (the relative expanding a demonstrative and indefinite pronouns as well as proper names; cf. Polotsky, 1962, sec. 9; Shisha-Halevy, 1981, pp. 321f.): Mt. 3:14, ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲉⲧⲉⲣ ⲭⲣⲓⲁ ⲉⲃⲓ ⲫⲏⲥ, It is I who need to be baptized; Mt. 9:5, ⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲑⲙⲟⲧⲛ ⲉⲭⲟⲥ, What is it that is easy to say? Mt. 2:22 ⲁⲣⲭⲉⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲟ, It is Archelaos that is king; Mk. 8:37, ⲫⲏ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓⲫ ⲛⲧⲉⲫⲃⲓⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲫⲯⲩⲭⲏ, This is what a man will give in exchange for his soul.

3.2 Extraposition. Bohairic is strikingly topic-marking, favoring a front (topicalizing) extraposition as topic of a nominal sentence (Gn. 24:65, ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲧⲏ, Who is this man yonder?) and in other constructions (Shisha-Halevy, 1981, p. 321). The rear extraposition of a noun lexeme to an "interlocutive" (first-second person) pronoun is marked in Bohairic by ⲋⲁ- (e.g., Acts 10:41, Jas. 4:12).

3.3 Nominal Syntagmatics. The Bohairic system of determinator nuclear pronouns ("articles") is quaternary: definite-deictic ({ⲡⲓ-}), definite nondeictic ({ⲡ-}), indefinite ({ⲟⲩ-}), generic, nonindividualizing (ϐ-). Of these, the first two are interrelated in a complicated, still partly obscure set of factors, some external (cotextual), others internal (i.e., selection of {ⲛ-} by a special lexeme paradigm in a construction {ⲡ-} ⲛ̀- expressing inalienable possession, opposed to {ⲡⲓ-} ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ, which expresses noninherent "appurtenance"). Elucidating this issue is probably the most urgent single task to be undertaken by students of this dialect. ⲛ̀- is also used to add further lexemes to the determinator-plus-lexeme basic unit: ⲡⲓ= ⲟⲩⲟ₂ ⲛ̀-, as in Mt. 23:17, 19, ⲛⲓⲥⲟϫ ⲟⲩⲟ₂ ⲙ̀ⲙⲉⲗⲗⲉ, the stupid and blind; *Acta Martyrum* 1.21.2f., ⲟⲩⲣⲉⲭⲫⲉⲛ₂ⲏⲧ ⲟⲩⲟ₂ ⲛ̀ⲛⲁⲏⲧ (nom. predicate) "pitiful and merciful."

3.4. The predication of possession is effected in Bohairic by a paradigm of adverbial-predicate patterns predicating ⲛ̀ⲧⲁ- (Lk. 3:11), and not only by a verboid (ⲟⲩⲟⲛⲧⲁ-/ ⲙ̀ⲙⲟⲛⲧⲁ-, as in Gn. 16:1; cf. Shisha-Halevy, 1981, pp. 317f.). The pronominal *possessum* never occurs as object of the verboid, but as the subject of the adverbial predication (Dt. 4:38).

3.5. The pronominal subject of affirmative bimembral nominal sentences is sometimes zeroed when it is anaphoric to a determinator or an extraposed topic (Shisha-Halevy, 1981, pp. 328f.; I Cor. 5:18, ⲉⲫⲟⲓ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲉⲩ† ⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉ ⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲟⲩⲧⲓⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ). The most common instance of this is the distinctively Bohairic possessive ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲫⲱ- (ⲛ̀-) (Lk. 6:30, 16:12).

3.6. ⲟⲣⲟ, the grammatically operative causative infinitive of ⲓⲣⲓ, is in Bohairic subject to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule and thus incompatible with the mediate (ⲛ̀-/ⲙ̀ⲙⲟ-) direct-object construction in the bipartite pattern (Stern, 1880, p. 292; e.g., Mt. 5:32; De Vis, 1922–1929, 1.14.6).

3.7. The bipartite pattern predicating an adverb favors the intermediation of a copular stative (Gn. 26:24, †ⲭⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲕ, I am with you).

3.8. Gender. The cataphoric gender in "impersonal" predications is as a rule the feminine. On the other hand, the pronominal subject of the predicate ("to the debit/obligation of . . .") is (at least as a variant) the masculine: Gal. 5:3, ϥⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲃⲏ ⲫⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣϥ, he is obliged to observe the whole Law.

3.9. Tempuslehre Idiosyncrasies. The so-called third future is in Bohairic a true tense, not a mode, in paradigm with the present-based imminent future marked by -ⲛⲁ-. The conjunctive has often a subjunctival or "that"-form value (Stern, 1880, sec. 442), such as expanding the cataphoric feminine in "impersonal" predications (Mt. 5:29, ⲥⲃⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛ̀ⲛⲉⲕⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲧⲁⲕⲟ, It is good for you that one of your members perish . . .). The second relative perfect form serves not only its topicalizing adnominal function but also as a temporal-protatic "temporalis" topic before a main clause (constituting a "topic-comment" nexus on a macrosyntactic level of analysis; Jn. 11:28, ϥⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲁⲥϫⲟϥ ⲁⲥⲫⲉ ⲛⲁⲥ, Having said this, she went away). The temporal clause is thus not expressed by a specific clause-tripartite conjugation base. (Incidentally, the second perfect in Bohairic cannot be further converted by the circumstantial converter.) The final and conditional clause paradigms include in Bohairic the conjunctive (after Greek final conjunctions of ⲉⲫⲱⲡⲓ, respectively, I Cor. 12:25, Mt. 6:14ff.). The postimperative paradigm lacks in Bohairic a specific marked apodotic form (ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ- in other dialects, especially Sahidic) and features, typically, imperative

and jussive forms (Mt. 9:6; Lk. 7:7) beside the non-specific conjunctive (Acts 6:3) and ⲟⲩⲟ2 plus future tense (Mt. 7:7; Prv. 4:6). The "ethical dative" is regular after ϣⲉ in the nondurative conjugation (ϣⲉ ⲛⲁ⁄).

3.10. Prosody and Juncture. Elements of relatively weak stress in the utterance (native Egyptian enclitic particles, augentia, ⲁⲛ, the "backgrounding" ⲛⲉ) tend to a sentence-posterior, "trailing" position (Shisha-Halevy, 1981, pp. 319f.; e.g., Mt. 23:4, 26:44; Jn. 5:30, Lk. 16:2).

The relative converter ⲉⲧⲉ, when expanding the formal demonstrative antecedent ϥⲏ or ϥⲣⲏ†, may be separated from the converted conjugation-form by at least two adjacent paradigms ("slots"), the first (pro)nominal and the second adverbial (Shisha-Halevy, 1981, p. 318; e.g. Dt. 2:25, ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲁⲩϣⲁⲛⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲩⲉϣϣⲟⲣⲧⲉⲣ, they who shall tremble if they hear your name; Col. 3:7, ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲑⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲥⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲓϣⲟϣⲓ ⲛ̀ϩⲣⲏⲓ ⲛ̀ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ, those in which you too used to walk); this indicates that the converter/conjugation-form seam is juncturally open to a degree.

3.11. The functional range of the coordinating ⲛⲉⲙ- is considerably extended in Bohairic, entailing reduced functions for ⲟⲩⲟ2. (ⲛⲉⲙ- is preferred as a coordinator of noun syntagms.)

4. Lexicon: Idiomatics

4.1. The Bohairic lexeme inventory, idiosyncratic to a considerable extent, has never been properly researched in respect of either its internal or its contrastive structure. In the unstructured lexicon peculiar to Bohairic, occasionally in common with Fayyumic (e.g., ⲙ̀ⲃⲟⲛ, be wroth; ⲟⲩⲱϣⲡ, send; ⲕⲏⲛ, cease; ⲅⲗⲟⲭ, foot; ⲥⲕⲉⲛ, side; ⲭⲱϥ, pour; ⲉⲡϣⲱⲓ, up), one notes cases of 1:1 correspondence with Sahidic (ⲉⲙⲛⲟ† : ⲉⲕⲓⲃⲉ, breast; ⲍⲗⲏⲏ : ⲥⲃⲟⲩⲣ, left side; ⲑⲱⲟⲩ† : ⲥⲱⲟⲩ2, gather), 2:1 (ϣⲏⲣⲓ + ϩⲣⲟ† : ϣⲏⲣⲉ, children; ϣⲗ- + ⲥⲗ- : ϣⲗ-, unto), 1:2 (ⲕⲏⲛ : ⲟⲩⲱ + ⲥⲱ, cease, have done), and so on.

4.2. Although no overall statistics are available on the Greek-origin component of the Bohairic lexicon (cf. Kasser, 1966, and Bauer, 1975), one impressionistically notes the higher frequency in Bohairic of the use of Greek loanwords as well as their broader semantic spectrum and their number in absolute terms, which is larger in comparison with Sahidic usage. Some loans (e.g., ⲉⲥⲧⲱ ⲁⲉ, ⲉⲛ ⲟⲓⲥ, ⲙⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲅⲉ, ⲧⲟ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ, ⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲟ, ⲟⲩ ⲣⲁⲣ) are exclusive to Bohairic and show to what extent it imported ready-made Greek phrases; others (e.g., ⲡⲱⲥ, ⲟⲩⲛ, ⲥⲁⲣⲁ, ⲥⲓⲛⲁ) do occur elsewhere, but are much more common in Bohairic.

4.3. Phraseology and idiomatics are again virgin fields of study. Peculiarly *B* are, for instance, ⲉⲣ ⲟⲩ (ⲛⲁ⁄), what for, to what purpose?; ⲛⲉⲙ-, ⲛⲉⲙⲁ⁄, together with; and ⲛ̀ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲭⲓ ⲁⲛ, not small, for *S* ⲛⲟⲩ, ⲥⲁⲥ ⲛ̀-, ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ (Acts 12:18, 15:2, etc.).

5. Varieties of Bohairic

5.1. Without taking a stand on their relative status and relative chronology, one can point out the following main subdivisions, or *Gattungen*, that *B* texts fall into, from the grammatical point of view. Given the current state of knowledge, one can do no more; as more evidence comes in (e.g., following the publication and evaluation of the "Old Bohairic" Twelve Prophets, unbiased consideration of Nitrian sources) and as the general dialectological picture becomes clearer (as it surely will, following the publication and study of "Middle Egyptian" evidence), one may be able to integrate these types of Bohairic in a coherent system.

5.2. "Classical" scriptural Bohairic conventionally serves as a *point de repère* for judging other types and is usually used for "Bohairic proper." Although it is by no means homogenous (being often variously blended with Nitrian; see 5.4), it nevertheless represents an optimal *testo di lingua*, especially in "good" consistent manuscripts (such as Vat. copto 1 and Bibl. Nat. copte 1).

5.3. A group (again, not monolithic) of fourth- and fifth-century biblical texts—extremely early documentation in comparison with the bulk of Bohairic scriptural sources—differs sharply from the classical idiom in linguistic usage. The largest single document of this kind published to date is Papyrus Bodmer III, containing the Gospel of John (Kasser, 1958, and 1966, pp. 66ff; cf. DIALECTS); another extensive manuscript containing the Twelve Prophets in the Vaticana was studied by H. Quecke. In Bodmer III one finds, among others, the following idiosyncrasies: ⲙⲙⲁ, there; ⲥⲛⲁ, two (for the classical ⲙ̀ⲙⲁⲩ, ⲥⲛⲁⲩ); ⲟⲩⲟ2ⲉ, and; the negative conditional ⲁⲛⲛⲏϥ; the preterite relative converter ⲉⲣ- (known also in Gnostic Sahidic, Subakhmimic, and Middle Egyptian); absence of the djinkim; *flottement* of ϩ~2, ϭ~ⲭ, ϥ~ⲡ. Under the same heading, one may also include some shorter biblical texts of approximately the same early dating, including passages from James (with the djinkim; Quecke, 1974) and a biblical anthology (Husselman, 1947). On some "Bohai-

ric" elements in Old Coptic, see Kahle (1954, pp. 243f.).

5.4. Nitrian Bohairic is attested mainly in hagiographical, homiletic, and hermeneutical texts from the Nitrian Monastery of Macarius, where they are generally supposed to have been transposed from a Sahidic *Vorlage* in the ninth century, but is also found "seeping through" into classical sources. This idiom has not yet been redeemed from neglect due to the bias of "secondhandedness" and "tainting," and Nitrian grammar has not had the attention it deserves. Phonologically, one observes here ϩ fluctuating with ϩ (e.g., in ϩϩρηι, down) and ϭ with ϫ (in coϫ, fool; ϫⲁⲙⲟⲩⲗ, camel). Typically there are ϥϣⲏⲛ, tree; ⲥⲏⲟⲛⲧ, form; ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲧⲛⲟⲩ, stand up; and ⲕⲟⲩⲓ, small. Sporadically, combinatory aspiration is absent. As regards morphology, one finds ⲁ~ⲉ for the second present converter; ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ- is found as a variant of prenominal ⲉⲧⲉ-; in certain classes the presuffixal allomorph of the verb lexeme is extended to the prenominal state, leveling simplification into two—absolute and preobject—allomorphs (see Polotsky, 1930, p. 875 [=*CP* 344]): ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ-, ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥ-, ϥⲟⲛ-, ⲧⲟⲙ-, ⲟϥ-, ϥⲟⲩⲟ-; typical are the conjugation bases ϥⲁⲛⲧⲉ- and ⲛ̀ⲧⲁⲛⲧⲉ- (first sing. ⲛ̀ⲧⲁⲛⲧⲁ-, ϥⲁⲛⲧⲁ-); ⲑⲏⲛⲟⲩ occurs for the second plural after ⲛ̀ⲧⲟⲧ-. One encounters the "freezing" of the possessive suffix in ⲡⲉϥⲣⲱϥ, ⲡⲓⲣⲱϥ (Polotsky, 1934, p. 61 [=*CP* 366)]; Greek loan verbs occur also without ⲉⲣ-. Syntactically, one finds the relative to be compatible with indefinite determination (ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϥ-, Balestri and Hyvernat, 1907–1950, 2.206.23; ⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲉϥ, *Homélies* 1.101.4) and the circumstantial expanding definite nouns (ⲡⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡ̅ⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛ̀ⲁⲏⲟϥ, Balestri and Hyvernat, 1907–1950, 2.184.22f.). As in Sahidic, the second tense may have a nonadverbial focus (Polotsky, 1944, pp. 22, n. 1, and 31; 1971, pp. 126, 135). The negator ⲁⲛ is compatible with independently negative elements: ⲛ̀ⲙⲟⲛ- ⲁⲛ (Balestri and Hyvernat, 1907–1950, 1.9.8), ⲛ̀ⲥⲉⲣ- ⲁⲛ (*ibid.* 216.3). The regulation of ⲛⲓ- ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ- versus ⲛ- ⲛ̀- adnominal expansion appears to be disrupted or changed. ⲛⲉ occurs (as a backgrounding of macrosyntactic subject) after verb forms other than the imperfect (Hyvernat, 1886–1887, 135.13f., ⲁϥ-; 146.6f., ⲉⲩ-, circumstantial; 150.13, ⲟⲩⲟⲛ). Although many of these traits are attributable to the influence of Sahidic, this is by no means true of all.

5.5. Liturgical Bohairic has never been especially considered from the grammatical point of view. The djinkim occurs over most consonants, including surds; phonetic spellings are very common. ⲛ̀- is often zeroed. Some of the syntactic characteristics of Nitrian Bohairic are in evidence; the word order is occasionally remarkable; "agrammatical" constructions (such as ϫⲉ + fut. I in a final clause, ϥⲉ ⲛⲁ- in the durative conjugation) occur. Nominal sentences with zeroed ⲛⲉ are common; the conjunctive occurs in initial position.

5.6. Nonliterary Bohairic is still a complete mystery. The sixth–eighth-century inscriptions of Kellia in Wādī al-Naṭrūn belong here only in a sense (they include tombstone and other personal religious texts); they are interesting (and as yet unresearched) from the linguistic point of view. One finds here sporadic variation of ϧ ~ ϫ, ⲟ ~ ⲱ, ⲉⲙ ~ ⲙ; the conjunctive ⲧⲉ-; the spelling ⲉⲗⲗⲁⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ; sporadic absence of nasal-labial assimilation (ⲛ̀ⲧⲙⲁⲙⲏⲛ) and of combinatory aspiration (ⲡⲏⲉϥⲏ). Proper names are expanded by ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ (ⲓⲱⲥⲏⲫ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲙⲉ). On the whole, the language conforms with the classical rather than the Nitrian standard of Bohairic.

5.7. Kahle's "semi-Bohairic" Bala'izah no. 19, a fourth-century papyrus text with passages from Philippians, shows some Fayyumic and Sahidic affinities.

6. Selected Bibliographical Information

6.1 Major or Comprehensive Text Editions. Biblical, hermeneutic: Tattam (1836, 1852 [Prophets]), de Lagarde (1867, 1886 [Pentateuch, New Testament Catena]), Burmester and Devaud (1925, 1930 [Psalms, Proverbs]), Porcher (1924 [Job]), Horner (1898–1905 [New Testament]). Patristic, hagiographical, homiletic: Hyvernat (1886–1887), Balestri and Hyvernat (1907–1950), de Vis (1922–1929).

6.2 Grammatical Discussion. Andersson (1904) contains, beside blatant errors, a few notable observations. Mallon (1956) is the only modern special grammar (cf. Polotsky, 1959, his major treatise concerning Bohairic, as well as 1930, 1934, 1944, 1950) with extensive bibliography, chrestomathy, and glossary; it leaves much to be desired. While Peyron's venerable grammar (1841) is still of value, Stern (1880) is still by far the best treatment of Bohairic (as of Sahidic) grammar; the Schwarze (1850) grammar is skeletal, but contains numerous important grammatical observations. Note also Schwarze's unwieldy work of 1843, and the early grammars by Tuki and by Scholtz and Woide (both 1778). Chaîne (1933), a detailed and extensive contrastive-dialectological grammar, has many merits and makes quite a few pioneering statements. Till (1931) is superficial and almost useless (cf. Polotsky, 1934). Finally, Erman's famous, yet unfollowed, contrastive study of

juncture (1915) aims at reviving interest in Bohairic, and Shisha-Halevy (1981) dwells on some conservative characteristics of this dialect.

6.3 General Dialectological Discussion. Kahle (1954) is still the prime source of information (esp. pp. 231ff., 248ff.). Worrell (1934, esp. chaps. 1–2) treats Bohairic phonology and the general status of the dialect. Vergote (1973, Vol. 1b) discusses *B* phonology as a component in a panoramic presentation. Bohairic features in all of Kasser's important dialectological studies (see esp. 1981, pp. 92ff.).

6.4 Lexicology. Only Peyron and Tattam (both 1835) cater specially to *B*. The priceless information in Crum's *Dictionary* (1939) must yet be resolved for the individual dialects. G. Bauer's concordance (1975) of the invariable Greek elements in the Bohairic New Testament is a welcome tool of research, which, one hopes, is to be extended to the rest of the Greek, as well as the indigenous, lexicon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andersson, E. *Ausgewählte Bemerkungen über den bohairischen Dialekt im Pentateuch koptisch.* Uppsala, 1904.

Balestri, G., and H. Hyvernat. *Acta Martyrum*, I. CSCO 43, 44. Paris, 1907, 1908. *Acta Martyrum*, II [Text]. CSCO 86. Paris, 1924. See also Hyvernat, 1950.

Bauer, G. *Konkordanz der nichtflektierten griechischen Wörter im bohairischen Neuen Testament.* Wiesbaden, 1975.

Burmester, O. H. E. and E. Dévaud. *Psalterii Versio Memphitica e Recognitione Pauli de Lagarde.* Louvain, 1925.

———. *Les Proverbes de Salomon (Ch. 1, v. 1–14, v. 26*, Ch. 24, v. 24—v. 29 et v. 50*—v. 77 et Ch. 29, v. 28—v. 38), texte bohaïrique du Cod. 8 de la Rylands Library, Manchester, du Cod. 53 et 98 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane et du Cod. 1051 du Musée Copte au Caire, avec les variantes de 24 autres manuscrits et index des mots coptes et des mots grecs.* Vienne, 1930.

Černý, J. "The Bohairic Verbal Prefix ⲁⲛⲛⲉϥ-." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 90 (1963):13–16.

Chaîne, M. *Eléments de grammaire dialectale copte.* Paris, 1933.

Crum, W. E. *A Coptic Dictionary.* Oxford, 1939.

Erman, A. "Unterschiede zwischen den koptischen Dialekten bei der Wortverbindung." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin* 1 (1915):161–72.

Horner, G. W. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, Otherwise Called Memphitic and Bohairic.* London, 1898–1905.

Husselman, E. M. "A Bohairic School Text on Papyrus." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6 (1947):129–51.

Hyvernat, H. *Les Actes des martyrs de l'Egypte.* Paris, 1886–1887.

———. *Acta Martyrum*, II [Translation], *Additis Indicibus Totius Operis.* CSCO 125. Louvain, 1950.

Kahle, P. E. *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir el-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt.* London, 1954.

Kasser, R. *Papyrus Bodmer III: Evangile de Jean et Genèse I–IV,2 en bohaïrique.* CSCO 177–178. Louvain, 1958.

———. "A propos des différentes formes du conditionnel copte." *Muséon* 76 (1963):267–70.

———. *L'Evangile selon Saint Jean et les versions coptes de la Bible.* Neuchâtel, 1966.

———. "Prolégomènes à un essai de classification systématique des dialectes et subdialectes coptes selon les critères de la phonétique, I, Principes et terminologie." *Muséon* 93 (1980a):53–112. ". . . , II, Alphabets et systèmes phonétiques." *Muséon* 93 (1980b):237–97. ". . . , III, Systèmes orthographiques et catégories dialectales." *Muséon* 94 (1981):91–152.

Lagarde, P. A. de. *Der Pentateuch koptisch.* Leipzig, 1867.

———. *Catenae in Evangelia Aegyptiacae Quae Supersunt.* Göttingen, 1886.

Lefort, L. T. "Littérature bohaïrique." *Muséon* 44 (1931):115–35.

Mallon, A. *Grammaire copte, bibliographie, chrestomathie et vocabulaire,* 4th ed. rev. M. Malinine. Beirut, 1956.

Peyron, V. A. *Lexicon Linguae Copticae.* Turin, 1835; repr., 1896.

———. *Grammatica Linguae Copticae.* Turin, 1841.

———. *Lexicon Copticum.* Berlin, 1896.

Polotsky, H. J. Review of H. de Vis, *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 33 (1930):871–81.

———. "Zur koptischen Lautlehre II." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 69 (1933): 125–29.

———. Review of W. C. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik, mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch. Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger* 196 (1934):58–67.

———. *Etudes de syntaxe copte.* Cairo, 1944.

———. "Une question d'orthographe bohaïrique." *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte* 12 (1949):25–35.

———. "Modes grecs en copte?" In *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum,* pp. 73–90. Boston, 1950.

———. "Zur Neugestaltung der koptischen Grammatik." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 45 (1959): 453–60.

———. "The Coptic Conjugation System." *Orientalia* 29 (1960):392–422.

———. "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen." *Orientalia* 31 (1962):413–30.

———. *Collected Papers*. Jerusalen., 1971.

Porcher, E. "Le Livre de Job, version copte publiée et traduite." *Patrologia Orientalis* 18 (1924):209–239.

Quecke, H. "Ein altes bohairisches Fragment des Jakobusbriefes (P. Heid. kopt. 452)." *Orientalia* 43 (1974):382–92.

Scholtz, C. and Charles Godfrey Woide. *Grammatica Aegyptiaca Utriusque Dialecti*. Oxford, 1778.

Schwartze, M. G. *Das alte Ägypten, oder Sprache, Geschichte, Religion und Verfassung des alten Ägypten nach den altägyptischen Originalschriften und den Mittheilungen der nicht-ägyptischen alten Schriftsteller*. Leipzig, 1843.

Schwartze, M. G. *Koptische Grammatik . . . , herausgegeben nach des Verfassers Tode von Dr. H. Steinthal*. Berlin, 1850.

Shisha-Halevy, A. "Bohairic–Late-Egyptian Diaglosses." In *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*, ed. D. W. Young, pp. 314–38. East Gloucester, Mass., 1981.

Stern, L. *Koptische Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1880.

Tattam, H. *Lexicon Aegyptiaco-Latinum, ex Veteribus Linguae Aegyptiacae Monumentis, et ex Operibus La Crozii, Woidii, et Aliorum, Summo Studio Congestum, cum Indice Vocum Latinarum*. Oxford, 1835.

———. *Duodecim Prophetarum Minorum Libros in Lingua Aegyptiaca Vulgo Coptica seu Memphitica ex Manuscripto Parisiensi Descriptos et cum Manuscripto Johannis Lee . . . Collatos Latine Edidit*. Oxford, 1836.

———. *Prophetae Majores, in Dialecto Linguae Aegyptiacae Memphitica seu Coptica, Edidit cum Versione Latina*. Oxford, 1852.

Till, W. C. *Koptische Dialektgrammatik, mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch*. Munich, 1931; 2nd ed., 1961.

Tuki, R. *Rudimenta Linguae Coptae sive Aegyptiacae*. Rome, 1778.

Vergote, J. *Grammaire copte*, Vol. 1a, *Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes), partie synchronique*, and Vol. 1b, *Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes), partie diachronique*. Louvain, 1973.

Vis, H. de. *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane*. Copenhagen, 1922–1929.

Worrell, W. H. *Coptic Sounds*. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1934.

ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY